REMARKS

A Request for Continued Examination has been filed in conjunction with this response.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky. Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Levosky and Rounthwaite.

In view the Applicant's amendments and arguments presented in the previous response, the Examiner has maintained the rejection based on Levosky, noting that Levosky teaches the use of a freeform field that allows the user to enter a comment that is associated with the generated pseudonymous email address. The Examiner makes specific reference to Figure 4, and notes that the freeform field allows the user to enter identification information.

Applicant has amended claim 1 for the sake of clarity. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the request for creating a pseudonymous email address contains "the request containing website identification information *in a pre-defined format*" (emphasis added), and submits that this is not merely absent in the teachings of Levosky, but taught away from.

Applicant submits that, as taught in the specification as filed, the website identification information is generated automatically without user intervention, and is used by the pseudonymous email address generator to in analysis of which websites inappropriately use the generated email addresses. As this is generated without user intervention, it will be performed in the same manner by a series of different clients, each requesting pseudonymous email addresses, thus, it is submitted that "the request containing website identification information in a pre-defined format" is fully supported by the specification as filed.

Levosky clearly teaches, as illustrated by Figure 4, and in column 4 lines 49-57 that the user is provided the opportunity (but not the obligation to) enter a note in the field. As illustrated in Figure 4, users will often put in information in a form that will not be understandable by an automated process. Furthermore, requiring users to manually enter the information in a field means that the identification entered in the field will be freeform and will not follow a pre-defined format.

By ensuring consistency in the formatting of the field, the present invention permits centralized analysis of the use of the pseudonymous email addresses created by the pseudonymous email addresses generator of the present invention through the use of automated processes. This allows for better refinement in the development of spam detection based on domains, as it can provide an indication of which domains are re-distributing collected email addresses. Without a standardized format for the website identification information, this process becomes both more difficult and more inaccurate.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Levosky, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and as such incorporate all the features of claim 1, including those referred to above. Applicant further submits that Routhwaite does not teach the matter referred to above. As such, it is submitted that claims 2-8 are patentable, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the claims presently pending are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the application proceed accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,
HARDT, Dick C.

By: /Dilip C. Andrade/
Dilip C. Andrade
Reg. No. 53,942
Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP
1400-340 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 0A5
CANADA
Tel: (613) 566-2270
Fax: (613) 238-8775
Email: dandrade@perlaw.ca